



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

under conditions substantially similar to those admitted or proved to exist. *Collins v. People*, 194 Ill. 506. The test of admissibility is—Will it aid rather than confuse the jury? *Burg. v. Chic. R. I. & P. R. R. Co.*, 90 Ia. 106. The question of admissibility is one necessarily resting largely in the discretion of the trial judge. *State v. Smith*, 49 Conn. 376. But where experiments are relevant to the matter in issue and would tend to help the jury, exclusion is reversible error. *Farmer's & Mer. Bank v. Young*, 36 Ia. 44. Experiments must not be of an uncertain nature. *Ulrich v. People*, 39 Mich. 245. So it was inadmissible to show that two bloodhounds of the same breed as those used in tracking the supposed criminal, when put on the trail of a human being, had left it to follow the trail of a sheep. *Simpson v. State*, 11 Ala. 6.

EVIDENCE—DECLARATIONS—RES GESTÆ.—*BAKER v. DRAKE*, 41 SOUTH, 845 (ALA.).—*Held*, that the rule, that declarations of a party in actual possession of property asserting title in himself are admissible in evidence as part of the *res gestæ*, explanatory of the possession, does not extend to his declarations as to the history and source of such title.

The above rule applies equally to real or personal property. *Ray v. Jackson*, 90 Ala. 513. But the rule has not gone so far as to allow an agent's declaration as to the ownership of property in his possession. *Standefer v. Chisholm*, 1 Stew. and P. 449 (Ala.). The present owner's declarations against his title are admissible but not for the purpose of supporting his title or that of those under him or to contradict the witnesses of the other side. *gestæ*. *Roebke v. Andrews*, 26 Wis. 311; *Howell v. Hyack*, 2 Abb. Dec. 423; *Turner v. Belden*, 9 Mo. 797. Since possession is presumptive evidence of title, the declarations of the possessor made during the continuance of possession, may be put in evidence to explain the character of his possession when the title is in controversy and even declarations qualifying the possession of property, at the time of its sale, are admissible as a part of the *res* likewise as to the present possessor's declaration as that he holds it in his own right or as tenant or as trustee. *Thomas v. Wheeler*, 47 Mo. 363.

FOOD—REGULATING SALE OF BUTTER—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.—*EX PARTE DIETRICH*, 84 PAC. 770 (CAL.). Act requiring packages of butter offered for sale to be marked with their exact weight.—*Held*, not to be a valid exercise of the police power, but is unconstitutional as being a restriction on the right to property and privilege of following a lawful business.

The exercise of the police power must be reasonable. *Chicago v. Rumpff*, 45 Ill. 90. A law which interferes with property by hampering the owner in purposes of trade and commerce is unconstitutional and void. (A law requiring certain goods to be marked "convict-made.") In this case the required mark, itself, was detrimental. *People v. Hawkins*, 157 N. Y. 1. The police power is properly exercised in regulation of manner and sale of articles, by such requirements as will tend to insure against fraud and injury. *State ex rel Atty. Gen. v. Capitol City Dairy Co.*, 62 Ohio St. 350. Statute prohibiting sale of imitation butter unless colored pink has for its object the prevention of fraud and is constitutional. *Pierce v. State*, 13 N. H. 536. Rules for the conduct of most necessary and common occupations are prescribed, when from their nature, they afford peculiar opportunities for imposition and fraud. *Cooley, Const. Lim.*, 5th ed. 743. Where act provides for marking of packages containing oleomargarine, a city cannot grant a license